

REMARKS

The Office Action, dated January 23, 2007, has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered. The present amendment modifies claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120, all in accordance with the originally-filed specification. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-164 remain in this application, and claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120 are in independent form. Applicant submits that the amended claims more clearly demonstrate the novel and non-obvious differences between the present invention and the cited prior art.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82, 120 and 159-164 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement and the written description requirement. Further, claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82, 120 and 159-164 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as having insufficient antecedent basis in these claims. Both of these rejections are related to the Examiner's indication that the originally-filed specification does not provide any description of the "control parameter rule". References to such a "control parameter rule" has been removed, where appropriate, from all of claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82, 120 and 159-165. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

Next, the Examiner provisionally rejects claims 1-158 under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-42 of co-pending Application Serial No. 09/869,513 to Applicant. Applicant again notes that this rejection is provisional, and therefore will address this matter when the conflicting claims in the co-pending application have been patented. Finally, claims 1-158 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the previously-cited Salesky patent. In view of the foregoing amendments to

claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120, as well as the following remarks, Applicant requests reconsideration of these rejections.

Amended Claims Discussion

The Applicant has carefully considered the references of the Examiner in their entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. In particular, paragraphs 13 on page 7 through paragraph 55 on page 16 (plus paragraph 159 on page 16) of the Office Action have been considered in terms of the amended claims.

First, and as noted above, the terms “control parameter rule” has been removed from all of claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82, 120 and 159-165.

Next, the preamble in all independent claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120 has been amended to further focus on the business needs of the invention, while assuring that the process steps and structural limitations are able to stand alone. The term “augment” helps to now assist on focusing on the summary business needs discussed throughout the application. Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner’s attention to col. 2, paragraph [0016] of the published application US 2001/0014865 (“application” or “specification”) - the Brief Summary of the application and the last line. “Additionally, the system supports and augments a convention being held in a physical or venue-based center (such as Moscone Center in San Francisco)”. Also, the underlying business benefit of “on the Internet”, which is indicative of these business methods - found initially in the Abstract with “on the Internet” and then throughout the specification – has been added to the preamble to further clarify the usefulness of the present invention in addressing various evident business needs in the field, including the development and presentation of online convention content on the Internet.

Next, process step a. of the independent claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120 has been changed to read in its entirety “a. receiving, from the at least one meeting planner client, and electronically storing in virtual convention venue databases at a central website server for providing central website server system processing, a plurality of convention hosting policies and convention content information for a plurality of conventions.”

Within process step a. , the Applicant has expanded “convention databases” to now read “virtual convention venue databases”, plus “at a central website server” to now read “at a central website server for providing central website server system processing” to provide additional clarification of the unique aspects of the present invention. Applicant has further introduced the phrase: “a plurality of convention hosting policies”. Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner’s attention to col. 13, paragraph [0184] of the specification and the line “A meeting planner welcome 815 program provides the various policies and fee options of the virtual convention venue processes”. And, Applicant further draws the Examiner’s attention to col. 4, paragraph [0045] and the line “Cross-referencing fields are provided to the meeting planners database 310 tying in the specific convention to the meeting planner hosting and controlling the event”. The term “hosting” used in the application specifications is derived from the noun “host” which is defined in the American Heritage Dictionary by “One that furnishes facilities and resources for a function or event.” Placed with adjoining term “convention”, thus deriving “convention hosting”, clearly provides definition with applicable reference to the conventions and meetings industry. “Convention hosting” is then followed by the term and noun “policies” which is defined in the American Heritage Dictionary by “A plan or course of action, as of a government, political party, or business, intended to influence and determine decisions, actions, and other matters”. This inclusion of the term “policies” also corroborates the appropriate business method

characteristics of the claims; thus, the “convention hosting policies” enforce the participation in convention activity by the central website server system processing. Additional references to convention hosting policies can be found in the application at: col. 7, paragraph [0121], col. 9, paragraphs [0138] and [0142], col. 10, paragraphs [0148], [0153], and [0154]; col 11, paragraphs [0161] and [0162]; col. 12, paragraphs [0172], [0176], and [0178]; col. 13, paragraph [0181]; and col. 14, paragraphs [0201] and [0211].

To further assist in clarity, “virtual convention website program instructions” has been applied to process step c. of independent claims 1, 40, 43, 82 and 120, and the similar process step d. of independent claim 39. to further indicate the program instructions at the central website server and specified on Figures 2 and 4 and within the application. These process steps have all similarly been amended for the use of “convention hosting policies” as referenced above, with “using at least one of the plurality of convention hosting policies to determine participation in convention activity and use of the convention content information in a virtual convention venue, a physical convention venue, or any combination thereof”. In further substantiation of these terms, Applicant also respectfully draws the Examiner’s attention to col. 6, paragraph [0095] of the published application and the line: “The attendee client global searches and control program instructions 500 on the central website server 200 assists the attendee client 101 in determining what conventions are appropriate for their participation, ‘registering’ and ‘attending’ a convention in the virtual convention venue databases 300”.

Dependent claims 38, 81, 119 and 158 have all been amended in a like manner with “further comprising the step of receiving at the central website server from the meeting planner client convention and visitor bureau content information”. The convention and visitor bureau content information is specified multiple times in the application including at

col. 3, paragraph [0039], col. 5, paragraphs [0085] and [0090], col. 6, paragraph [0100], and col. 9, paragraph [0142].

Finally, dependent claims 159, 160, 161, 162, 163 and 164 have all been amended to now read: “...further comprising the step of tracking in the virtual convention venue databases measurements concerning the attendee client visits at the cyber exhibit booth”. Applicant respectfully draws the Examiner’s attention to col. 10, paragraph [0153] of the application and the lines: “...audit measurement is tracked in the virtual convention venue databases 300 concerning attendee client 101 visits at the booth or click-throughs from the panels for later reporting to the exhibitor/sponsor client 103, or for billing purposes. Fees and policies concerning the attendee client 101 visit measurement and billing of the exhibitor/sponsor client 103 can be set up by the meeting planner client 102 in meeting planner client support--program instructions 800”.

None of the Cited Prior Art Teaches or
Suggests the Novel Features of the Independent Claims

The above claim amendments distinguish the present invention from the Salesky patent and also attend to the Examiner’s detailed responses.

In the paragraph 13 of the present Office Action, the Examiner cited several references that suggest the features of the independent claims of the application; these are: (col 29, lines 62-63 and col 30, lines 15-24, potential conferee), (col 9, lines 64-67, col 30, lines 15-24), (record a session for later playback, col 24, lines 66-67 – col 35, lines 1-10, and col 29, lines 34-37, several meetings), (17, 15, fig 2, col 8, lines 34-41), and (record presentation or lecture or video-mail, 17, 14, fig 2, col 7, lines 10-20; col 8, lines 34-45, server provides information that allows attendee client conferencing software to start and connect to the conference). Emphasis appeared placed by the Examiner on the process of the

use of “keys” during the setup process from the Salesky patent in comparison to Applicant’s use of “control parameter rule” from the previous claim set with citations including: (at the time of setup keys can be specified, col 2, lines 7-15; col 9, lines 64-67), and (to determine that a client has sufficient computing resources requires processing of control parameters - at the time of setup keys can be specified, col 2, lines 7-15; col 2, lines 66-67; col 3, lines 1-23; lines 50-58).

Further, in paragraphs 60 and 61 the Examiner has responded that “the features upon which Applicant relies (i.e., website/ASP-based convention system) are not recited in the rejected claims(s)” and “the features upon which Applicant relies (i.e., including functional descriptive material, is loaded by a meeting planner client with the intended use of providing the website/ASP-based system) are not in the rejected claim(s)”.

In order to directly attend to the Examiner’s citations and comments, significant changes have been made to the claims; and, these changes are fully detailed and referenced to the application in the above Amended Claims Discussion section.

Applicant has expanded “convention databases” to now read “virtual convention venue databases”, plus “at a central website server” to now read “at a central website server for providing central website server system processing” to provide additional clarification of the unique aspects of the present invention. The Applicant submits that the intended use of the “virtual convention venue databases” at a central website server is clearly “for providing central website server system processing” and “processing the selection at the central website server by virtual convention website program instructions” in the invention. Applicant’s claimed invention describes substantial specifications which can now be read into the modified claims in terms of the convention venue databases 300 and website program instructions 400, on a central website 200. The “convention venue databases 300” is detailed

within the “System Structure” of the claimed invention (*see* col. 3, paragraph [0039] of the published application). These databases and website program instructions, on a central website are important structural differences between the claimed invention and the Salesky patent. The word or terms “website”, “website program”, “website program instructions”, or “central website” do not appear in the Salesky patent.

At cited referenced col 2, lines 7-15 of the Salesky patent we find: “The conference can be set up any time earlier by anyone with access to this server function. At the time of setup, one or more password character strings ("keys") can be specified for the conference. The key that a conferee gives at the time of attempting to connect to the conference server determines whether that conferee will be allowed access to the conference and what the conferee's initial privileges will be for participating in the conference and for modifying the setup of the conference.” And at referenced col 9, lines 64-67 of the Salesky patent we read: “In some cases, server 14 might be operating without attendees. Such a configuration is useful where the presenter wishes to "record" a session for later playback. Even a session with attendees can be recorded for later playback, possibly including a recording of the voice conferencing. These stored sessions might be stored in session archive 23 or elsewhere.”

The archiving in the Salesky patent is provided for so a user can record a shared-display communication webcast session for later playback. The underlying equipment-network-software topology of the Salesky patent is found at column 3, lines 56-58 which states: “the ‘communications server’ connecting the ‘source’ and ‘sink’ client machines of the ‘communicants’ during a communication session”. The Applicant respectfully argues that the intended use of the “conference server” in terms the “keying privileges” and “record” feature cited by the Examiner deal with the “tightly bound” (col. 7,

line 22 of the Salesky patent) shared-display communication webcast session, and not with storing a plurality of convention hosting policies and convention content information at a central website server for providing central website server system processing as claimed in the invention.

Continuing, the Applicant respectfully argues that the system and method claimed by the Salesky patent, performed in its normal and usual operation, does not and, indeed, cannot perform the system and method claimed by Applicant. The attendee client software specified in the Salesky patent is client-based, and corresponds “tightly bound” (col. 7, line 22 of the Salesky patent) to the presenter client conferencing software. “The presenter client conferencing software, which is usually distributed tightly bound with the attendee client software to facilitate presenter hand-offs from conferee to conferee, captures information (such as image, sound, or other output information) from a program or programs running on the presenter's machine and relays it to the server”. Col. 7, lines 21-27 of the Salesky patent. Applicant respectfully submits that there is nothing inherent or obvious about receiving from an attendee client a selection for convention content information from the plurality of conventions after such convention content information and convention hosting policies are loaded by a meeting planner client (or administrator) at a central website server for providing central website server system processing. The database design and computer programming supporting the process of receiving such a selection and releasing appropriate content for such a selection is novel and requires non-obvious database fields and relationships, and processing steps, for example processing controlled by the convention hosting policies included in the functional descriptive material for the attendee client's navigational experience.

In clearing up the terms and in further support of the above argument, Applicant again notes that all references to “control parameter rule” have been removed from all of the claims; and, Applicant has introduced the phrase: “a plurality of convention hosting policies”; hence, the significant specifications of “convention hosting policies” from the application and definitions as referenced in the above section can now be read into the claims. Again, making use of the term “policies” also corroborates the extensive business method characteristics of the claims; thus, the “convention hosting policies” enforce the participation in convention activity by the central website server system processing. The Applicant respectfully argues that this enforcement of the “convention hosting policies” in terms of determining the participation in convention activity by the central website server processing as claimed in the invention is not comparable to the Salesky patent in general, nor the reference cited by the Examiner for the prior use of the now-uninvolved term “control parameter rule” (at time of setup keys can be specified, col 2, lines 7-15; col 9, lines 64-67) in particular.

The Applicant now respectfully argues that the use of the term “meeting contents” (col. 24, lines 66-67) in the Salesky patent is mere naming or description of the stored recordings of the communications session data streams, and is not an assertedly anticipating reference and does not provide an enabling disclosure of the Applicant’s subject matter which is comprehensively supported by functional descriptive material. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that “meeting contents” at column 24, lines 66-67 are not comparable to and conflicts with Applicant’s term “convention content information”. Accordingly, the Salesky patent does not define, disclose, teach or suggest “convention content information for a plurality of conventions” as specifically set forth in the amended independent claims of the present application where “a plurality of convention hosting

policies and convention content information for a plurality of conventions” is stored “in virtual convention venue databases at a central website server for providing central website server system processing”.

The claimed invention solves many fundamental problems and introduces functions missing in early website work and patents, and is a significant contribution to the state of the art. For the foregoing reasons, none of independent claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120, as amended, are anticipated by or rendered obvious over the prior art of record, whether used alone or in combination. In particular, none of the Salesky patent nor any of the prior art of record teach or suggest the method and system for conducting a convention, as specifically set forth in these claims. There is no suggestion in any of the references cited by the Examiner to combine these references in a manner that would render the invention, as claimed, obvious. Reconsideration of the rejection of independent claims 1, 39, 40, 43, 82 and 120 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-38 and 159 depend either directly or indirectly from and add further limitations to independent claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 1. Claims 41 and 42 depend directly from independent claim 40, and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 40. Claims 44-81 and 160 depend either directly or indirectly from and add further limitations to independent claim 43, and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 43. Claims 83-119, 161 and 162 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 82, and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 82. Claims 121-158, 163 and 164 depend either directly or indirectly from and add further limitations to independent claim 120, and are believed to be allowable for the


Application No. 09/809,595
Paper Dated: March 23, 2007
In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of January 23, 2007
Attorney Docket No. 1762-001648

reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 120. Therefore, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-38, 41 and 42, 44-81, 83-119 and 121-164 is respectfully requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that claims 1-164 are patentable over the cited prior art and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By 
Nathan J. Prepelka
Registration No. 43,016
Attorney for Applicant
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1818
Telephone: (412) 471-8815
Facsimile: (412) 471-4094
E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com